

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 18, 2008. Claims 1-7 and 9 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 7, and 9 are in independent form. Claims 1, 7, and 9 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,972,863 (*Parry*). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Parry*, in view of an alleged admission on page 1, ll. 23-27, of the originally filed specification; and Claim 6 was rejected as being unpatentable over *Parry* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,137,590 (*Mori*). Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 7, and 9, together with the claims dependent from Claims 1 and 7, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus. The image processing apparatus includes read means, authentication means, search means, setting means, and output means. The search means are for reading an image on a document that contains image storage information representing a location where an original image of the document is stored. The authentication means are for authenticating whether a user can utilize an original image of the document. The search means are for searching the original image of the document from an image storage device which stores the original image of the document, on the basis of the image storage information when the user is authenticated by the authentication means. The setting means are for automatically setting, in accordance with an authentication by the authentication means, a destination for the original image of

the document to an address of the user authenticated by the authentication means. The output means are for outputting the original image of the document searched by the search means to the destination set by said setting means.

Among other features of Claim 1 are the setting means for automatically setting, in accordance with an authentication by the authentication means, a destination for the original image of the document to an address of the user authenticated by the authentication means. By virtue of this feature, a destination for an original image of a document is automatically set to an address of a user authenticated by authentication means, in accordance with an authentication by the authentication means. This feature is useful to facilitate setting the destination and avoiding an unintentional setting of the destination.

Parry relates to a printing method in which a data stream that contains a barcode can be received at a printer which can detect and translate the barcode into a network address to which the printer can make a document request for the document to be printed. Even if *Parry* discloses a user selecting a transmission address, that does not suggest that the address of an authenticated user should be automatically set in accordance with an authentication. The data described in *Parry* is merely a URL address where an access request for a document is sent. All that appears to be set in *Parry* is the destination for an access request, and not a destination for the original image of the document to an address of the user authenticated by the authentication means. In fact, nothing in *Parry* is believed to teach or suggest any correspondence between the document that is to be printed and whether it is an original image of the data that the barcode is embedded into.

For these reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over *Parry*.

Independent Claims 7 and 9 include features similar to Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 4 based upon an alleged admission at page 1, ll. 23-27 of the originally filed specification. Applicant submits that no admission has been made and that the characterization of that portion of the specification is improper. The cited portion of the specification mentions that a scanned image (generally compressed) attached to an e-mail can be transmitted. Since Claim 4 does not refer to transmitting scanned images, the cited portion of the specification relied on in the Office Action is not an admission of anything contained in Claim 4.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2212452v1